

The Converted Catholic.

A Monthly Publication

Specially designed for the Enlightenment and Conversion
of Roman Catholics.

Edited and Published by Father O'Connor at 60 Bible House New York.

APRIL, 1885.

Vol. II. No. 5.

Subscription \$1.00 per annum.

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes.....	129	"Search the Scriptures." Sermon	
Reformed Catholic Work.....	131	by Rev. John J. Casey, B.D.	141
Converts from Rome. Letters		The Moral Theology of the Jesuits.	
from many Converts, and		Introductory Sketch of the	
Renunciation of the Church		Jesuits.....	145
of Rome by Rev. Father D.		Father O'Connor's Letters to	
Mackay, Edinburgh, Scot-		Cardinal McCloskey (second	
land.....	133	series). Letter IV.....	150
Kind Words.....	139	Rome: Pagan and Papal (con-	
A Letter and an Answer.....	140	tinued). Chapters viii., ix..	154

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE testimonies of "Converts from Rome" will be eagerly read. Father Mackay's letter from Scotland and his renunciation of Romanism show how the light of God's truth is shining in the souls of the priests and people in all lands.

OUR hearty thanks are due to the Rev. Dr. Farris, the learned and wise editor of the *St. Louis Presbyterian*, for his kind notice on page 139.

There are few ministers or editors, if any, in the United States who have a more thorough knowledge of the Roman Catholic question than he has, and the columns of the *Presbyterian* continually give evidence of this.

Ask any Sabbath-school child, "What is a Jesuit?" or "Who are the Jesuits?" and the answer will be, "I don't know." If superintendents and teachers of Sunday-schools will read the "Introductory Sketch of the Jesuits" in our article on "The

Moral Theology of the Jesuits," and tell their pupils the substance of it, young America will know all the main facts about the Jesuits.

WE wish every Roman Catholic priest in the United States and Canada, and Great Britain also, could read the admirable sermon of Rev. John J. Casey, B.D., on page 141. Father Ryan "the poet-priest of the South," to whose lecture in Montreal this learned sermon of Mr. Casey is a reply, has a singular history, which we may give to our readers some day. He is a poet of no mean order. For many years he has not been attached to any particular diocese of the Roman Catholic Church. Thereby hangs a tale.

THREE TIMES WITHIN THE LAST few months our office has been visited by the "Sisters of St. Francis" and the "Little Sisters of the Poor," two orders of nuns in the Roman Catholic Church. On another occasion when we were showing a lady through the Bible House, we met two "Sisters" in one of the departments. Each time their mission was soliciting contributions for the Roman Catholic institutions of the city. Every month the City of New York donates \$50,000 from the Excise Fund to those institutions. But that is not sufficient. As those "Sisters" told us, "they go everywhere begging for money." Yes, even into the rum-shops and other evil places; but certainly the last place we expected to meet them was in the Bible House, for it is not many years since the Pope cursed the Bible Society for daring to distribute the Scriptures without note or comment to all mankind. The lady men-

tioned, who is a member of Dr. John Hall's church, rebuked them for going into rum-shops, for the money they received there could not bring God's blessing with it. "Oh," said they, "it is 'Sisters' from Brooklyn, Jersey City, and Newark, who come over to New York and go into such places." This showed their Jesuitical training. It is hard to refuse any one who begs an alms in the name of religion, or on account of poverty, but we submit that it is not wise to encourage this method of building up the Roman Catholic Church. Many of those "Sisters" are refined and educated ladies who do this work through blind obedience. With them the end justifies and sanctifies the means, and the end sought for is to extend and strengthen the power and influence of the Roman Catholic Church. Our prayer to God is that he may open the eyes of those poor nuns and make them see that only Christian methods of work can build up the Church of Christ.

A LADY FROM BOSTON WHO HAS lived in Brooklyn this last winter, and who has frequently attended our services in Masonic Temple, New York, writes to us: "I hope to get some of my friends here to subscribe for your excellent monthly. As I said to Father Chiniquy, my heart is in full sympathy with him and you in your great and good work. I was glad to see his sermon in the March number. I send your publications away as soon as I read them, for such works cannot be circulated too widely."

And a minister in Pennsylvania writes: "Send me 100 copies of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* every month

to circulate among the heads of families in my congregation. The Roman Catholics are pressing on us on every side here and we want just such literature to enlighten them. Your kind Christian spirit smoothes away the rough edges of controversy."

And yet another minister writes from Connecticut: "I hope you will get out Father Chiniquy's sermon, 'The Crucified Jesus and the Penitent Thief,' in tract form similar to your beautiful tract, 'The Portrait of Mary in Heaven.' If those tracts be distributed widely they will exert a powerful influence for good among both Protestants and Catholics."

We are pleased to accede to this request, and to announce that we have published Father Chiniquy's Sermon in a tract of 24 pages in the same form as "The Portrait of Mary in Heaven." We have placed the nominal price of a few cents on each of these tracts to pay for the printing and postage, but our subscribers can have as many copies for distribution as they desire, by sending the necessary stamps for postage.

THE REV. GEORGE F. PENTECOST, of Brooklyn, says of one who is favorably known to our readers: "The Rev. John C. Collins is one of the most earnest workers in the ranks of the ministry. His monthly publication, *The Gospel Union News*, is in a large measure a reflection of his spirit and methods, and must be an inspiration to its readers." An extended notice of *The Gospel Union News* appears on the fourth page of our cover.

We hope our friends will still continue to get one new subscriber each, even for six months at 50 cents.

Reformed Catholic Work.

Unless vigorous and determined opposition be manifested, the Freedom of Worship bill will become a law in the State of New York. The Rev. Dr. J. D. Fulton preached on the subject at the usual services of the Reformed Catholic Church, in Masonic Temple, in February, and since then Father O'Connor has spoken twice on the subject. Sunday evening, March 22d, there was a large audience in Masonic Temple, despite the intense cold, and much interest was manifested. Father O'Connor read the text of the bill, the chief points of which are contained in the following sections:

"SEC. 2. This act shall be deemed to apply to every incorporated or unincorporated society for the reformation of the inmates of houses of refuge, protectories, or other reformatory or penal institutions continuing to receive for its use either public moneys or a *per capita* sum from any municipality for the support of the inmates.

"SEC. 3. The rules and regulations established for the government of the institutions mentioned in this act shall allow and provide for holding religious instruction and for private ministration for the inmates in such manner as may best carry into effect the spirit and intent of this act; and the inmates of such institutions shall be allowed spiritual advice and spiritual ministration from such recognized clergyman of the denomination or Church which said inmates may respectively prefer, or to which they may have belonged prior to their being confined in such institutions; such advice and ministration to be

given within the buildings where the inmates are required by law to be confined.

"SEC. 4. It shall not be lawful to compel any of such inmates to attend any religious exercise not conducted by a clergyman of the denomination to which such inmates may belong, or may have belonged at the time of their reception; and in all matters pertaining to religion, the rights of conscience of such inmates, and the free exercise thereof, shall be carefully respected.

"SEC. 5. The wilful violation of any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed a misdemeanor."

According to this act every hospital as well as every penal institution in the State that receives grants of public money must set apart a room for holding service according to the Roman Catholic Church. Such service is not preaching the Gospel. Far from it. Confession of sins to a priest, the sacrifice of the mass, prayers to the Virgin Mary and saints, rosaries, scapulars, medals, pictures, crucifixes, the use of holy water, and above all, belief in the power of the priest—these constitute religious services in the Roman Catholic Church. The *New York Tribune* of March 23d gives this brief report of the remainder of Father O'Connor's discourse:

"At the regular Sunday service of the 'Converted Catholics' last night, in Masonic Temple, the Rev. James A. O'Connor delivered an address on the Freedom of Worship bill. He said it was the duty of Americans to protest against the passage of this bill and spoke of the 'unscrupulous grasping power of the Roman Church.' 'The adoption of this bill,' said he,

'would simply be the entering wedge for the Church of Rome to obtain control over all the institutions of this State. In the House of Refuge the plain, simple Gospel is preached, but this is not sufficient for the Roman Church, which claims the right to dictate to all mankind on spiritual matters. What is called the "means of grace" places unlimited power in the hands of the priest, and he calls in the aid of the Virgin Mary and saints to strengthen him. Public men cater to the priests, and the last election shows how these appreciate the power of the Roman Church. In our Republic, grant the demands of the Roman Church and she will turn on the liberty and freedom of this country as the Irish Catholics have turned against England.'"

During the month of March there have been many inquirers at the close of the services and during the week. After the discourse referred to, a young lady came to speak to Father O'Connor. She had always been a Roman Catholic, as were her whole family, but she heard some things in the sermon that evening that made her doubt whether her religion was not wrong in making so much of the power of the priests and turning the people from Christ to the Virgin Mary. She was told that it was too true, that the Roman Church had taught the people "to pluck the crown from the head of Jesus and place it on the head of Mary." But intelligent persons like herself were beginning to see through such gross delusions.

The Rev. Stephen Dekins still continues his good work in the Reformed Catholic Church, Newark. Rev. Wm. Fox has recently addressed the congregations of several churches in Brooklyn. May our good God send us more converted Catholic workers.

CONVERTS FROM ROME.

This month we give another selection from our correspondence, and we again request our readers to send us the names of all their acquaintances who have been converted from the Roman Catholic faith. There are thousands and tens of thousands of them all over the United States. Stand up, brethern, and while confessing your faith in Christ, do not hesitate to point out the false doctrines that are still keeping your loved ones according to the flesh separated from all other Christians. You will be a light unto them, as surely as some one has been a light unto you.

The first of the following letters is from the young lady whose interesting letter appeared in our last issue. The letter from her sister, who is a Sister of Charity, will be read with mingled feelings. Our Catholic readers will say that it is a most touching letter from one sister to another, and while our Protestant readers will concede this, they will see the hand of the Jesuit in it, trying to win back the convert through her affections and sympathies.

MY DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST:

I received your very kind and welcome letter, and also a copy of your monthly. I feel it is useless for me to try to tell you how pleased I was to see the great and noble work you are doing. It has encouraged me to go on and do the work which I feel the Lord has called me to do. It seems very sad that when Catholics are converted, they should lose interest in those who are still living under the spiritual cloud of Romanism. If on the Day of Judgment, some of

those souls are lost that are on the road to destruction now, what a dreadful thing it will be if it is said to us, "you did not do all you might have done to save that soul."

I do not mean to say that I think all Roman Catholics will be lost; indeed I do not for a moment think so, for I believe there are many Christians in that Church; but I do sincerely believe that there are many who to-day are keeping up the forms of the Church and do not think of anything beyond that; and when Roman Catholics lose their faith in Romanism they generally go into infidelity. And if not told of their situation and they should die in that condition, they are, of course, eternally lost. After I lost faith in Romanism I still kept up the forms of the Church, caring little for anything except my family honor, and the love which I bore those who were its members. And thus was I bound by the chains of Romanism for over three years, having no faith in its doctrine, but knowing as I did that if I broke away I would also have to tear myself away from all whom I held dear on earth—that I would have to leave that kind and loving mother who had cared for me when I was unable to care for myself, that I would have to part with those brothers whom I all but adored, that I would have to leave that home which I loved so dearly, knowing as I did that its doors would be forever closed to me, and that I would have to go out into the wide world, cold and heartless as it is. It was indeed quite a step for a young lady of my age to take. I am only nineteen, the youngest of seven children, five brothers and one sister. I always had the advantage of a beautiful home and

loving parents and brothers. One of my brothers is now studying for the priesthood in Montreal, and one practising law in New York State. My sister, as I have already told you, is a Sister of Charity in Pennsylvania. She has lately been transferred. She has written me once since I have been here, and I send you her letter. You will see in it some of the wiles of Romanism. But I assure you that it is not the kind of letter my dear sister would like to write to me, for she was a beautiful person. Of course that convent must have spoiled her.

Yours in the love of Christ,
A. C. F.

ST. MARY'S CONVENT,
BLAIRSVILLE, INDIANA CO., PA.
TO MISS A. C. F.

MY DEAR SISTER:

I have been thinking of writing to you for sometime, but did not know your address until mamma sent it to me. I was surprised to hear you are attending school. Why did you not write and tell me all about your school, and how you liked it? Are there many pupils from P—— there? I think it is so strange mamma did not tell me all about you. I hope you are very prompt in writing home. You know our dear parents will feel it most keenly if you are negligent in writing to them. I suppose you remember that eight years ago you and Joe had the happiness of receiving for the first time our Blessed Lord in the blessed sacrament, after which you were confirmed. Oh! Anna, was not that a happy day for you! As I am writing, I can return in thought to that morning and picture your happy little face as you sat eagerly waiting for Joe to

accompany you to church. Trusting, my dear sister, you will ever keep the promises you made that day to our good God to be faithful to Him until death, I remain, my darling sister,

Yours most devotedly in the Sacred Heart,

SISTER MARY E——.

P. S.—Please write me a good long letter soon, and I promise to answer it immediately.—S. M. E.

CLINTON, CLINTON CO., IOWA.
FATHER O'CONNOR—

DEAR SIR:

Enclosed you will find subscriptions for your publications. I am now going to give you a surprise: one dollar of this sum is from a cousin of yours. You have two cousins living here in Clinton, I have lived near them for many years, but did not know they were your cousins until a month ago. They both married brothers by the name of A——. I gave Mrs. George A—— your "Letters to Cardinal McCloskey," and asked her to subscribe for *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*. She asked me to send for a copy for her, which I did. One month passed and I called again; when she told me she had discovered that Father O'Connor was her own cousin, that her father was born in the same town that your father was, and his name was John O'Connor, and that she also had an uncle by the name of Bartholomew. As she reflected upon the matter she concluded without a doubt that you were her cousin. Another reason is that she had a visit from one of her aunts who resides in Chicago, and on inquiring of her about the matter, she found it to be the same as she had thought at first; and so the

matter stands. You must excuse me for sending such a long letter, but I thought it would be a source of pleasure to you to know that you had relatives in Clinton, Iowa, who attend the Protestant Episcopal Church. I am a Scotch lady, and am greatly interested in your work. Although I cannot do much to help you, yet I never forget you, and your work at the "Throne of Grace." Wishing you every blessing. I am ever your sincere well-wisher.

MRS. R. R.

We have received many letters like the following. In every such case where *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* is read, not only by the person who receives it, but is circulated, especially among Roman Catholics, we are only too happy to send it free. We may add that we have a large list of good people who cannot spare a dollar these hard times, and if those whom the Lord has blessed with means will contribute to a fund for the free distribution of our Monthly to those who will wisely and widely circulate it, but, like our esteemed correspondent, cannot afford to pay for it, they will be doing a good work.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.,

Feb. 7th, 1885.

MY FRIEND:

I thank you for sending me so many of your magazines, but I know you cannot afford to send them, nor can I afford to subscribe; so please discontinue, though I enjoy them. I must tell you what I did with those you sent me. We all read them, then I lent them to a dear friend, a converted

Roman Catholic, a member of the Reformed Dutch Church. She lent them to three sisters, all Roman Catholics, one of whom said that "every word in those magazines was true." After they were returned I put them in a package and sent them to old Father Rogers, a very old priest. There are some three or four priests here, and I did not know to which one I should send them, but with a prayer I sent them to Father Rogers, hoping that they might do him good. Wishing you success in all your great undertakings,

I remain, yours in the Lord,

MRS. J. S.

DESPLAINES STREET, CHICAGO.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR—

DEAR BROTHER:

I have been receiving your Magazine, *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, since last year. I am very much pleased with it. Just at present I am working at wages far below my expenses and cannot send my subscription. Try to continue me. My mother was raised in the Roman Catholic Church. I have been a very careful Bible reader for the last three years. I am a member of the Chicago Avenue Church (Mr. Moody's).

D. H.

DEAR SIR:

PERRY, N. Y.

I am a Catholic, but I am not satisfied with my Church. There are so many things in her teachings contrary to reason that I cannot believe them. I want your books and tracts, for I know they will help me to learn the true religion. Please send them to me and tell me what to do; also tell me in what Church I can worship God with more faith.

A. L. A.

BOSTON, February 5th, 1885.

MY DEAR BROTHER:

Please send me some more copies of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC and the "Portrait of Mary in Heaven." By looking at my signature you may remember me as having written to you several times regarding my wife, who when I married her last year was a strong Roman Catholic, but who by God's guidance has found the true way of salvation. I would say that she has come out on the Lord's side very brightly, and is now a member of an evangelical church with myself. Pray for us both.

Yours truly, A. E. K.

LAWRENCE, MICHIGAN,

January 30th, 1885.

DEAR SIR:

Please send me two copies of your "Letters to Cardinal McCloskey." I want them for a young Irishman who is almost converted from Popery to Christianity.

W. R.

The following pages will make the hearts of our readers rejoice at the conversion of Roman Catholics in all countries. This testimony from a Scotch priest is an indication of the drift of sentiment in Europe among priests and people regarding the Roman Catholic Church. God speed the work.

13 GLADSTONE TERRACE,

EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.

MY DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR:

I received your letter with sincere pleasure, and also your periodical. Allow me to congratulate you on the very able manner in which you con-

duct your most interesting monthly, I showed it to Rev. Mr. Divorty of the Scottish Reformation Society, who seemed to be delighted with it.

You say that a great many priests are leaving the Church of Rome in the United States. A few have left it here also. Father R—, of Helensburgh, left it, married, and joined the Church of England. Father W— left it and has joined no church as yet. Father M— and Father E— have also left, and Dr. C— is excommunicated for taking the bishops to law about a trust fund. Father F— is travelling the country like the wandering Jew. Father L—, an Edinburgh Jesuit, left Rome and married an excellent lady, and is in a very good institution here as Librarian in the Advocate's Library. I quitted the Church on purely theological grounds. I am unmarried and intend to remain so. I have joined the Scottish Episcopal Church. I am rejoiced to learn that you and your brethren have retained the glorious name of Catholic. You actually possessed it by right. It used to be one of the "notes" of the Church of Rome, but it has ceased to be so *de facto*, because Romanists are now less numerous in the world than other Christians, and therefore the Church of Rome has lost the "mark" of universality. But the proud title of Christian, which we all have, is of divine origin.

I cannot imagine how you are working your way in New York under such difficulties; but, I suppose, *fortuna favet fortibus*—fortune favors the brave—is true of brave men everywhere. It is clear at any rate, that you are doing very well without a Pope. The most important thing I

see in connection with your work is THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC. Be sure to attend well to it, and it will do your cause more good than any other agency.

I am so pleased that you are all evangelical, but you see that the Church of Rome is accounted as evangelical as ourselves since the Fathers at the Plenary Council of Baltimore have exhorted all American Roman Catholics to have Bible readings at least once a day! (*"Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis."*) "Times are changed and we are changed with them.") I shall be delighted to correspond with you regularly. God bless you.

D. MACKAY.

The following is Mr. Mackay's renunciation of the Church of Rome:

"It will not perhaps be uninteresting to the readers of the *Bulwark* to know that the pure light of Christianity is beginning to dawn upon poor benighted Romanists, and even upon those amongst them who have been fully trained in the whole religious system of Rome. There are a number of educated Roman Catholics scattered over the country who are not Catholics at heart, but Catholics in name. I myself was born a Catholic, bred a Catholic, studied for the Church of Rome, and was promoted to holy orders on 14th September, 1870. I served that Church faithfully for upwards of thirteen years, even when her doctrine stuck in my throat as false, perilous, and full of fraud to mankind. I severed, however, my connection with her on 30th April last, because I no longer considered it honest to be instrumental in perpetuating a religious

system which, if it ever became the dominant creed of the land, would stifle every breath of liberty, put an end to all progress, and deliver men over to a perpetual bondage here and to eternal perdition hereafter.

"To put my reasons for leaving the Church of Rome in a more technical form, I will say that they were of a twofold nature, doctrinal and persecutory.

"In the first place, therefore, it is a matter of great pleasure for me to have to confess that I had ceased to believe in the doctrine and superstition of Romanism several years ago. I could not believe in the Infallibility of the Pope, because, independently of other reasons, I found it to rest on insufficient Scriptural grounds. I could not believe in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, because it is devoid of any proof, Scriptural and otherwise, and contradictory in itself. I could not believe in Transubstantiation, for reasons which it would be too long to mention here. Nor could I acknowledge the worship of the saints, because Jesus Christ, the great centre and sole Mediator of our holy religion, is infinitely wiser, infinitely more knowing and appreciative of our wants than they are, and infinitely more merciful and bountiful, and infinitely nearer to us, being omnipresent, than all the saints put together. It was Jesus Christ himself who addressed to each of us this beautiful invitation, 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' He has not, therefore, told us in the trials, crosses, and anxieties of this life to go to any of the saints for relief, but to approach himself directly, the everlasting source of grace, consolation,

and happiness. I also rejected the scapulars, the rosaries, the *Agnus Dei*, the medals, and various charms of Romanism, which seemed to me only suited to the cloudy and imaginative taste of a semi-barbarous people. To a man whose mental attitude towards the corruption of Romanism was what I have described mine to have been for several years past, there was clearly no room for him in the Church of Rome.

"In the second place, I deeply regret to have to say, for the sake of the best feelings of our nature, that I have been the victim of a secret ecclesiastical persecution for several years past, the more insidious and dangerous on account of its very secrecy. The worst type of persecution is a religious persecution. In a persecution of this kind, it is not asked whether the means are lawful or not, but whether they will reach the offender in the name of religion. In a persecution of this kind the end invariably justifies the means. Religion then does not say, See how they love one another; but she says, See how they hate one another. My persecution culminated in a dangerous crisis in the last week of April last. No doubt, the secret, subtle persecution carried on for years against me has exceeded the wishes and expectations of my ecclesiastical superiors, but all that is irremediable now. Their wish was not to expel me from the Roman Catholic Church, because they could have done that a thousand times over, if they had liked. Their intention was not to let me go, but to hold the bridle fast, and goad me on to destruction, or dispose of me in some inscrutable way of their own within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church.

"As I have no time to go into details in a short paper of this kind, I will sum up my persecution by briefly stating that one of the noblest instincts which the hand of the Creator has planted in the heart of man is the instinct of self-preservation, and the right to live is the first right which man possesses when he comes into the world. It was to follow that instinct and preserve this right that I deliberately, and of my own free accord, walked out of the Roman Catholic Church on the last day of April, 1884. The story has been going the rounds at Sterling that I was suspended before I left the Church of Rome. It is false. When I sent the following message to my Bishop, 'I beg to intimate that I have ceased connection with the Church of Rome,' I was free from suspension, excommunication, or any other censure belonging to the Church of Rome, and in full possession and exercise of all the 'faculties' granted to any other priest in the Edinburgh diocese.

"In conclusion, I may mention that I wish I could inspire my countrymen and countrywomen with the same salutary dread of Romanism with which I am myself inspired. If the Church of Rome were to become the ruling Church in Scotland, we should no longer be governed by the laws of our country, nor by the pure, loving, and imperishable laws of Christianity, but by the canon laws of Romanism. The Church of Rome is a Church that has never yet shrunk from poison, fire, sword, and persecution, when these dangerous weapons suited her purposes. She is amongst us a silent, meek, and seemingly a civilizing power. But why does she appear in our midst in this innocent manner? Because she is

powerless to enforce her laws and to usurp our rights in order to make us her slaves. Any one who knows the Church of Rome thoroughly must pronounce her to be a huge conspiracy to defraud mankind of their natural and spiritual rights. A Frenchman said of Christianity that it was invented for the torture of mankind. This is decidedly true of the Roman Catholic Church, to which he must have referred. Scotchmen might add to their morning and evening prayers the following words: *Ab Ecclesia Romana, libera nos Domine*—from the Church of Rome deliver us, O Lord!"

Kind Words.

(From the St. Louis Presbyterian.)

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC is before us with an exceedingly interesting table of contents, among which are "Reformed Catholic Work," "Converts from Rome—letters from them and statements of their experience," "Rome and the Bible," "Father Chiniquy," "Monsignor Capel," "Father O'Connor's Letters to Cardinal McCloskey," etc.

This monthly is edited and published by Rev. James A. O'Connor, formerly a Romish priest, but now a believer in Jesus and a minister of his Gospel. Mr. O'Connor has a flourishing congregation of converted Catholics in New York, and, co-operating with other former priests of Rome who are now preaching the Gospel in Brooklyn, Newark and elsewhere, he is successfully laboring to lead priests, nuns, and laymen out of the bondage of superstition into the liberty where-with Christ makes his people free. This magazine is one of the most useful appliances in the work of these

earnest and devoted men. As an evidence of its success, it is now in its second year and has grown into a pamphlet of thirty-two pages. It reaches priests and private members, and shows them a way of escape, of which not a few are availing themselves.

The great question before American Protestants—the great question before American freeman—is the designs of the Romish Church in this country. As to this, we are not left to conjecture, but have the bold boast of these subjects of the Pope that they will get control of our National and State politics, of our National and State treasures, and thus make their superstition the dominant religion. How important then that Protestants should take the alarm and be fully aroused to the danger which so seriously threatens civil and religious freedom! Nothing in popular shape, and from an authentic source and at very moderate cost, is better calculated to inform and arm them than Father O'Connor's monthly CONVERTED CATHOLIC, especially as, in addition to the features we have already described, the April number will begin the translation of Gury's "Moral Theology of the Jesuits"—a text-book in Roman Catholic seminaries—twenty-five editions of which have been issued in Paris during the last five years, as a vindication of the French government for expelling the Jesuits from France. This treatise, which has been specially commended and blessed by the Pope and by which every priest is equipped for his work, will open the eyes of our easy-going, credulous Americans and Protestants to the exceeding nastiness, the horrible dogmas, the heartless despotism with which these enemies of God and man are plotting the overthrow of our liberties and the throttling of the Gospel.

Send \$1 to James A. O'Connor, 60 Bible House, New York City—giving plainly your name, Post-office, county and State—and get THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC for one year.

A Letter and an Answer.

We received the following communication in due course of mail:

JAVA, WYOMING CO., N. Y.,
January 25th, 1885.

J. A. Oconnor by whoos authority do you Send your fowl Stuff into my mail you dirty Liar discontinue Sending your insults to me or I will go to your Place and I will give you employment for a few minutes at the ind of a a raw hide that will Serve you in the world to come.

THOMAS KERWIN.

Now, Thomas, you were angry when you wrote that card, or I have no doubt you would have put your sentiments into better language. If you had read the Bible instead of following the teachings of the Church of Rome, you would know that, "An angry man stirreth up strife, and a furious man aboundeth in transgression" (Proverbs xxix., 22). But I presume you have no Bible and cannot refer to this passage. As a token of good will and to let you see that I mean you well and am not angry with you, I will send you a Bible if you will read it and promise on your word of honor that you will not burn it. Continue to read *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, but don't call it "fowl stuff," unless you wish to make it appear a crowing rooster. Well, it does crow and rejoice somewhat at being the voice of so many who are delivered from the yoke of bondage in which Popery had bound them. I shall continue to send it to you, and you will find, with God's help, that it will do you good. It has no room for unkind words or thoughts for you or any of our Roman Catholic brethern, and be assured that none such shall ever be found in its pages.

But you are a man of some intelligence, and doubtless you have a fine family of boys and girls growing up around you, like all honest Irishmen, and I put it to you whether it would not be better for you and them to serve God after the manner of your American Christian neighbors, than in the way our Irish Roman Catholic fathers had been taught by the Roman priests. Your children are Americans—if you haven't any now, you will some day, please God—and they should be brought up like other young Americans, and not as you and I were brought up. The faith of Rome has not benefited you or yours in this world, and if you should sell all your goods and give to the poor, and even have all charity, it would profit you nothing, for the priest would surely send you to purgatory after death.

Read the Bible and think for yourself on the points of difference between you and me; obey God rather than the priest or Pope; pray to our Lord Jesus Christ for yourself, and don't bother the poor Virgin Mary; confess your sins to him and he will pardon you, if you are repentant and have faith in his divine power. Now I know you have faith in the power of Father B. B. Grattan, the priest who attends your village. He may be a good man, and I hope he is, but he cannot forgive you your sins, nor do anything for your soul. All the Popes or priests or ministers in the world could not gain you admission to heaven. There the Lord dwells in his glory, and if you lead a Christian life here on earth with a full faith in Christ as your Saviour, he will receive you unto himself.

Your sincere friend.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

"SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES."

The following Sermon was preached in Taylor Presbyterian Church, Montreal, by the Rev. John J. Casey, B.D., in reply to a lecture on the Bible, delivered by the Rev. Father Ryan, the poet-priest of the South:

In this fifth chapter of John's Gospel. (John v., 39), and even in the words of our text, we have the claims of Jesus of Nazareth to be looked upon as the Messiah. It was necessary that one, who a few months before had worked as a carpenter, should be able to give the most convincing proofs of his divine mission. Those proofs we have most clearly set forth in the chapter from which our text is taken.

1. Jesus appeals to the testimony of John the Baptist. The whole Jewish nation regarded John as a prophet; and the Baptist in the clearest language had testified that Jesus was the Christ.

2. He appeals to his own miracles. The Jews had seen the wonderful things that he did; and one of their rulers had said: "No man can do these things which thou doest, unless God be with him."

3. He appeals to the testimony of the Father himself. When Jesus was baptized at the Jordan, the heavens opened, the Spirit descended as a dove upon him, and a voice was heard saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." But Jesus reserved the strongest proof for the last. The Jews professed to believe that the Holy Scriptures were the Word of God; they professed to find in them eternal life. Jesus did not

contradict this belief; on the contrary, he made his strongest appeal to the testimony which the Scriptures bore with regard to him, "Search the Scriptures," said he, "for you think in them you have life everlasting; and the same are they that give testimony of me." We purpose this evening to obey this command of Christ; and in doing so we shall endeavor to answer three questions:

I. What are the Scriptures? II. Why were they given? III. To whom were they given? The discussion of these three questions will, we believe, cover the whole ground.

I. What are the Scriptures? or, in others words, what did Christ mean when he said, Search the Scriptures? He meant that portion of the Book which lies before me that is called the Old Testament. Were Jesus to use the words now he would mean by them the whole Bible from Genesis to the end of the Revelation, or Apocalypse. The Bible, at first sight, seems to be one book; but when we examine it we find that it is divided into two great portions, called, "The Old and the New Testaments." These are again subdivided into still smaller portions. We find, moreover, that this book is the combined work of no less than forty authors, who wrote at different times during a period of about sixteen centuries; and the history which it contains covers more than four thousand years. Some portions of the Book were written on the banks of the Nile; others in the desert of Arabia; others again in Palestine; whilst some were written in Greece, and some even in imperial Rome. Yet all of those portions, taken together, form a connected written

Revelation. Were we to ask, who were the men who united in writing the Bible—what was their position in life? the wonder increases. We find every class of society represented among them—the king and the peasant, the tradesman and the philosopher, the shepherd, the fisherman, and the great leader of armies. As might be expected you will find every kind of literary composition here, poetry, the most exalted in style, and prose, rugged in form, yet possessing wondrous thrilling power. The subjects that this Book deals with reach the greatest heights and descend into the lowest depths of humanity; it tells of every woe that rends the human heart; it may be read with equal interest by the king and the beggar, by the profoundest philosopher and the humblest child. Such is the Book to which Jesus nineteen centuries ago directed the minds of his Jewish countrymen, when he said to them: "Search the Scriptures."

But a second question must be answered.

II. Why were the Scriptures given? This is a question of great importance. We cannot understand any book thoroughly until we know the object for which the book was written. Were we to read, for example, the "Adventures of Gulliver" as we would read the famous travels of Livingstone, we should utterly mistake the meaning of the authors; in the one we have fiction, in the other facts. Were we again to take up one of Shakespeare's historical plays, and look upon all that we find there as historical truth, we should again be mistaken. Those plays do contain historical truth; there were such men as Cæsar and Mac-

beth; but the parts that Shakespeare makes them play upon the stage were not all played by them in real life. We must, therefore, keep in mind the object which the writer had in view in order to understand the book which he wrote. It is so with the Bible. If we take up the Scriptures in order to learn from them the truths of science and philosophy, we shall find that we have the object for which they were written. Science, and history, and philosophy are to be found in the Bible; and men of the highest attainments in all these branches of learning have revered the Scriptures. Such men have left on record that their researches in nature, and their studies of the laws of the human mind strengthened their faith in the written Word of God. But still, if you wish to understand the Scriptures, you must first learn why they were given to men. Let us turn to the Book itself and learn from its pages why it was written. John says in the 20th chapter of his Gospel: "These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in his name." Such was God's design in inspiring men to write the Scriptures. He lays open before us the great book of nature, and says: "Here you may study science; in its pages you may learn the laws that govern the works of my hands; but the prophets and preachers of old were inspired by my Spirit to write those Scriptures that men might know me, and learn how best to worship and serve me. Search the Scriptures, and learn from them the truths that nature cannot reveal." Were the rocks formed to tell us of the immortality of the human soul? Can the

stars, as we gaze into their awful depths, speak to us of Christ and eternal bliss? No. They are silent, they reveal none of these truths to men. Scripture, therefore, begins where Nature ends; its voice is heard when Nature cries out, "I can reveal no more."

Yet men say: "The Bible is only a book; it cannot speak to us. Were God to speak to man from heaven, he would speak the words of this Book; but the Bible itself cannot speak." Such was one of the arguments used by Father Ryan, a few evenings ago, in his lecture on the Bible. It is hard to see what the "Poet-Priest," as he is called, really meant. Did he mean that the voice of God would be surer than the teaching of Scripture? Not so thought St. Peter, who heard the voice of God upon the Mount of Transfiguration. In the first chapter of his Second Epistle the Apostle refers to that voice which years before he had heard upon the Mount, and compares the voice of God which he heard from the heavens, and that voice which all may hear who read with faith the Holy Scriptures. What does he say? "We have," said he, "the more firm prophetic word, whereunto you do well to attend." Had not men heard the voice of God when he spoke to his Son; and did they not say, "it thundered," whilst others said, "an angel spoke to him"? Well would it have been for the Church which Father Ryan represents had she believed the words of him whom she claims as her first Pope: well would it have been for her had she remembered the words of Peter's Lord: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them: for, if they hear

not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe, if one rise again from the dead." Yes, truly might Peter say: "We have the more firm prophetic word, whereunto you do well to attend." There is a beautiful passage in a letter which St. Augustine wrote to his sister. He told her that the only place of safety for her was the Word of God: "Be, dear sister," he wrote, "like the dove which frequents the fountain of water, where she can not only quench her thirst, but in its clear depths, as in a mirror, see the hawk which seeks to destroy her. Holy Scripture is like rivers of water which flow from the most limpid fountain of wisdom." Thus wrote Augustine to his sister, and yet this was the man whom Father Ryan quoted as if he were opposed to the private reading of Scripture. You and I cannot understand all that is contained in this Book. Who can explain the mystery of the Trinity? Who can understand the union of the human and divine in the person of Jesus Christ? But the youngest child in this house may know that "God is love," and that "the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." And now we come to our last question.

III. To whom were the Scriptures given? Were they intended only for the teachers of the Christian Church? or, were they written for all men without exception? To the question, should all men read the Scriptures? Protestantism answers, yes. We shall therefore give a few of the reasons why Protestants, from the times of Luther, have been zealous in spreading a knowledge of the Scriptures among the people.

1. Because the Scriptures were originally intended for the people, and not solely for the teachers of the

Church. The learned Jesuit, Father Schouppe, in his "Course of Sacred History," says "that the Bible is the best book for the priest: it is his treasure-house, for from it he is to draw forth all the good things which a true priest ought to dispense to his congregation;" but Protestants hold that what is good for the priest ought to be good for the people. This too seems to have been the belief of the Apostles. Take, for example, the Epistle of Paul to the Church at Rome. The opening verses of that Epistle show that it was addressed not to the ministers alone, but "to all that are at Rome, the beloved of God, called to be saints." Yet that Epistle is the most difficult of all Paul's writings to be understood. James wrote his beautiful epistle "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad." Peter wrote to "the strangers dispersed through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," not to any bishop, or any Church. One of John's Epistles was written to a woman, another was addressed to a man, named Gaius. "Ah! but," says the poet-priest, "the Apostles were then alive, and were the infallible expounders of what they wrote." Yes, Father Ryan, that is true; but those inspired Apostles were more humble than you priests of Rome. Hear what Paul said to the Church of Corinth: "I speak as to wise men; judge ye yourselves what I say;" and this first Epistle was sent not to Corinthian believers only, but, "to all that invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place of theirs and ours." Need I remind you that this same Apostle on another occasion praised the people of Berea, who listened patiently to what he said, and then searched the Scriptures to see if he taught in accordance with the Word of God. Would any of your bishops, Father Ryan, have acted with the spirit of Paul? Do not the words, "*anathema sit*," come more readily to their lips than they came to the lips of the inspired Apostles

of Jesus Christ? Let your Church say what she will, the priests are not the sole custodians of the Word of God.

2. Another reason why we believe that the people should have the Scriptures is, that God in times past always spoke to the people in the language which they best understand. He never spoke in an unknown tongue to any people. Look at the original Scriptures themselves. The earliest, and by far the largest portion of Scriptures was written in the Hebrew tongue. Why? Because Hebrew was then the common language of the people. But, about six hundred years before Christ, the Jewish people were brought captives to Babylon, and remained there seventy years. During that time the people forgot their own language, and learned the language of the country in which they lived. What do we find then? We find the prophet Daniel revealing the will of God to man in the Chaldean tongue. And when Christ came, and he sent his Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature, did they not reveal the will of God to man in the language most widely known? They wrote not in Hebrew, nor in Chaldee, but in Greek. What further proof do we need that God intended that his Word should be for all? This was a truth which the Church of the earliest times understood better than the Church of the middle ages. Then holy men translated into Syriac, and Latin, and other languages the oracles of God. And shall not we, who know the value of that Word, imitate those saintly men in their zeal in extending the knowledge of God's truth? Yes, we shall go on until the Scriptures are translated into all the languages of the earth—until all men shall be able to read in their tongues of the wonderful works of God—until the promises of Scripture shall be fulfilled, and Christ "shall receive the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." May God, in his mercy, hasten that time.

AMEN.

THE MORAL THEOLOGY OF THE JESUITS.

Translated for **THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC** from the "Theologia Moralis" of Father Gury, S. J., the Text-book used in Roman Catholic Seminaries.

INTRODUCTORY SKETCH OF THE JESUITS.

The founder of this remarkable society, Inigo Loyola (he afterwards changed his first name to Ignatius), was born in the province of Guipuscoa, Spain, in 1491, eight years after the birth of Martin Luther. He was the son of a Spanish nobleman, and, as was the custom of the country, was devoted to the military life. Loyola was no more a saint in his youth than were the other soldiers around him, but his mind was imbued with lofty aspirations and the chivalric spirit of the age. At about the age of thirty he received a severe wound in the leg, at the siege of Pampeluna, in the war between the Emperor Charles V. and the French king, Francis I. During the lingering sickness which followed this wound he employed himself in reading books of romance and the lives of the saints, till combining the two ideas of chivalry and devotion to the Virgin Mary, he resolved to become a knight errant in the cause of the Virgin. The Reformation was then commencing in Germany. When Loyola was restored to health, he was a changed man. The soldier had become a saint. He betook himself to study, self-mortification and penance. He journeyed to Italy and to Jerusalem, and there on the spot where Christ was crucified, claimed to have received from the Saviour himself a revelation that he should found a new order, to be called "The Society of Jesus." Returning home, he was joined by Lainez (the second general of the order), Francis Xavier, Salmeron, Bobadilla, Rodriguez, and Le Fevre; and in 1534 these seven united in recording their solemn vow at the altar of St. Denys, in the city of Paris. In the year 1540 a bull was granted by Pope Paul III., sanctioning the order of the Jesuits, granting to the members the most ample privileges, and appointing Ignatius Loyola the first general of the order, with almost despotic power over its members. In return, Ignatius and his followers were to render unlimited obedience to the Pope, and to hold themselves in readiness, at a moment's notice, to go to any part of the world to advance the interests and to promote the designs of the Holy See; and the wily pontiff was too sagacious not to perceive the immense value of such an army of obedient soldiers to fight his battles in all parts of the world.

The object of the society was fourfold: 1. The education of the young in schools and colleges; 2. The instruction of adults by preaching; 3. The defence of the Roman Catholic Church against heretics and unbelievers; 4. The propagation of Romanism among the heathen by missionaries.

Loyola had seen that Luther and the reformers had swept the universities and the students with them in their movement; he will meet that by educating

the young. He had seen the Reformation spread by preaching; he would train his disciples to preach. Protestantism was not only a protest against the false doctrines of Rome, but also against the supremacy of the Pope; he will meet that by teaching allegiance to the Pope as Sovereign Pontiff, and obedience to the doctrines and traditions of the Church. The Church was depleted by the loss of the Protestant nations; he would replete its ranks, by establishing missions among the heathen nations, and extending the boundaries of the Church to the new countries discovered in America, India, China, Japan.

The Benedictines, Dominicans, and Franciscans had failed to arrest the progress of the Reformation; he would try it by other means and novel methods. Among these were three ruling principles: 1. Obedience, that the member should be in the hands of his superior as a corpse in the hands of a physician; 2. That man in saving his soul is serving God; 3. Indifference to the means in reaching this end, hence the ruling motto, "The end justifies the means."

The conquests and reverses of the Jesuits have been the most remarkable of any of the orders in the Church of Rome. The society, like its founder, forms a romance in history. Originating in Spain, they entered France in 1540, where they met with many successes and reverses. Not only did they meet with opposition from the French government and Jansenists, but they were routed by Pascal's "Provincial Letters." As they were implicated in the assassination of Henry IV., the king of France, and attempted the wholesale murder of the king, lords and commons in England by blowing up the Parliament House (the Gunpowder Plot), they soon were hated and feared throughout Europe. In 1759, the Jesuits were banished from Portugal and Brazil. In 1767 they were banished from Spain and compelled to go to Italy. The next two years they were suppressed in all Roman Catholic countries, and even the Pope, Clement IV., was compelled to issue a bull against the order in 1773. The only places they could find rest and an asylum were the Protestant countries, Prussia and Russia. But Russia was compelled to expel them in 1820.

At the close of the European war, Pope Pius VII. restored them again to favor. In the Revolution of 1848, they fell again into trouble, but when Pius IX. was restored he called them into power. The Franco-Prussian war was their work. In our day they have been again expelled from France, Germany, and Italy. As a matter of fact, they have been at the bottom of nearly all the European wars for the last three centuries, and of most of the troubles that agitate the governments of the world. Their missions extended with great rapidity in India, China, and Japan; but interfering with the governments of those countries, they were driven out, and nearly all their missions vanished.

A few years ago the following article on "Jesuitism always and everywhere the same" appeared in one of the prominent journals of Europe:

"Wherever public opinion has had free utterance, the Jesuits have been denounced as public enemies. We have the history of this so-called Society of Jesus from September, 1539, to September, 1872, and can therefore trace its operations over a vast field, and without passion or prejudice form a correct

estimate of its character. An essentially political institution, at first dreaded by the very Church it was intended to save from threatened ruin, it first of all provoked the jealousy of a much more ancient body, the Universal Roman Inquisition, which it was very likely to supersede. Policy was better suited than violence to maintain the loathed supremacy of the Popes over nations. Between the two fraternities there was a similarity so close that neither could acknowledge any necessity for the existence of the other, and for many years their mutual jealousy had all the fretful impatience of a brothers' quarrel. Yet the Popes loved them both with a truly paternal affection, and after a time it was found possible to persuade them to harmonious co-operation in the needful service of propping up the falling house. Yet both were odious. Sometimes the Holy Father himself interposed to moderate the fury of Inquisitors, as in the famous case of Carranza, and sometimes he was persuaded to restrain the excesses of Jesuits for the prevention of scandal, but in every circumstance he had blessings for them both. Assuming the lofty air of universal father of kings and priests, he could gracefully bid the Jesuits be silent when opportune silence would prevent nation after nation from seceding from the Church of Rome; but any one who studies with common intelligence may see that Jesuitism, no less than Inquisition, is the very perfection of Popery. Either of the two is force. It is force physical or force political that subdues the subjects or conquers the enemies of the Papacy. Jesuitism, then, is only another and a more expressive name for Popery, and to represent it otherwise is either a trick or a mistake. Ignatius of Loyola raised an army to fight for the Church, only more skilfully than Dominic of Guzman had done before. Paul III. gave Ignatius his commission, as Innocent III. had given his to a more savage predecessor. Successive pontiffs covered this army with honors. Its battalions were stationed the world over under distinct commanders, headquarters being always at Rome, where the general-in-chief was in direct communication with the Pope, whether to obey or to command was doubtful at the best. Once, when nearly all the kings had expelled the several battalions from their dominions, Pope Clement IV. disbanded the whole army, as a temporary measure, after resisting the clamors of every state for about four years, and then for the sake of peace, as they say, well knowing that its existence was not at that juncture tolerable.

"Pius VII., in sweet revenge, sanctioned the Jesuit refugees in Russia by a brief in the year 1801. In 1804 he set up the society again in Naples, and in 1814, when England helped him to his liberty, he issued a bull for the complete re-establishment of the Jesuits throughout the world. Then came the restoration of the Bourbons in France, and during the reaction after the revolutionary war in Europe and in England they began those active operations, which issued in the act of Parliament to throw England open to Popery again in 1829. We well remember how some of the advocates of that act, when pleading for the toleration of *religious orders* in England, praised the Jesuits for great skill in *education*, and promised us much benefit from their assistance to raise the standard of education in all countries.

"Regicide is not only tolerated by their old casuists, but is openly applauded by living men, and in Spain it is well known that they were not innocent in the attempt to assassinate King Amadeo. It is also evident that in that project they have sympathy, and apparently participation, out of Spain. Paris papers, the *Union* and the *Universe*, greeted that outrage with applause as a *first and terrible warning* to Victor Emmanuel and his son, and declared that the attempt surprises no one, *and will very likely soon be followed*. Such are the instruments made use of by Jesuitism in these days of Christian charity!

"It is a fact that in addition to the vow never to marry, which they ridiculously call *chastity*, the Jesuit has *carte blanche* to follow his own discretion as best he may, for 'the greater glory of God,' which, according to the Romish view, is the most absolute submission to the confessor, and larger revenue to the Church. They are distinctly taught that the ordinary laws of justice may be broken through for the attainment of these objects, and the breach of them is but venial sin. A complete example seems to appear in the recent scandal at Brest, where the lady friend of an eminent Jesuit preacher is married to a French viscount on his death-bed, and shortly after his death, is detected in communication with the Jesuit himself. The discovery raises the town in indignation, and brings them both to trial for offending against public decency. But, remarkably enough, the chief culprit is acquitted from alleged defect of evidence; he suffers no censure, says mass every day, scandal is avoided, and a *mulier subintroducta* goes at large."

Dr. Döllinger, the famous Catholic historian, and one of the "Old Catholic" priests of Germany, now in his 85th year, thus describes the Jesuits—their work and fate:

"The experience of three centuries shows that the Jesuits have no lucky hand. No blessing ever rests on their undertakings. They build with unwearied assiduity; but a storm comes and shatters the building, or a flood comes and washes it away, or the worm-eaten edifice falls to pieces in their hands. The Oriental proverb about the Turk applies to them, 'Where the Turk sits grass never grows.' Their missions in Paraguay, Japan, and among the tribes of North America have long since gone to ruin. In Abyssinia they had once (in 1625) almost attained dominion; but some time afterward (in 1634) the whole concern collapsed, and they never ventured to return there. What is left to-day of their laborious missions in the Levant, the Greek Islands, Persia, the Crimea, and Egypt? Scarcely a reminiscence of their former presence there is to be found on the spot.

"Above all, the Society of Jesus devoted its best services to its native home in Spain. The result was bankruptcy and depopulation of that once powerful kingdom, and its loss of one possession after another, so that by the end of the seventeenth century it had become an inanimate corpse, the skeleton of a giant. It is behind every other country in Europe except Turkey, and, having no healthy literature of its own, has to feed on the foreign literature of France. Well might a Spanish diplomatist in Rome say at the suppression of the order, 'The Jesuits are the wood-worm that gnaws at our bowels.'

"They it was that brought on the German nations the Thirty Years' War and its results, and to them Catholic Germany owes the decline of its schools, and its consequent backwardness in cultivation and long intellectual sterility. It was they who completely undermined the ancient German and Catholic empire, and paved the way for its fall. They, as the all-powerful conscience-keepers of the Hapsburgs, Ferdinand I., Ferdinand II., and Leopold I., have on their conscience the destruction of the liberties of the states of the empire, the enforcement of absolutism, the oppression and expulsion of the Protestants.

"Bohemia has long been given over to the care and charge of the Jesuits, and what have they made of it? They have utterly destroyed the old Czeck literature, and have brought matters to such a pass that nearly the whole Bohemian nobility is annihilated through confiscation, execution, and banishment.

"In England [and Ireland] the destiny of the Catholics was for a century molded by the influence of the Jesuits at Rome, and history shows what a monstrous weight of misfortune and oppression they rolled down on the shoulders of their co-religionists.

"They tried to re-introduce Catholicism into Sweden by means of a liturgy forcibly imposed on the clergy, and with the help of the king, Sigismund, who was under their guidance. Sigismund in consequence lost his crown, and they were banished forever from the country. In Russia they undertook, by means of their instrument, the false Demetrius, to establish Polish influence, and to bring the empire and nation into subjection to the see of Rome; but their proselyte and *protege* was killed, and they had to quit the country. In Poland they dominated the king, the higher clergy, and the nobility for a long time—and Poland is destroyed. In France, the Jesuits were the conscience-keepers of the Bourbons, and their spiritual children, Louis XIV. and Louis XV., paved the way for the revolution and the destruction of the dynasty, or rather, one may say, made it inevitable. [And in the year 1880 they were expelled from France.]

"I readily leave to this order the fate of the Vatican decrees (namely, 1870, the infallibility of the Pope), the more readily, as it has the duties of paternity to discharge toward them; for the Jesuits excogitated, sketched out, and finally shaped those decrees, though with the assistance of certain bishops."

The Jesuits are generally most amiable men in society, polished in manner, acute, subtle, and "for ways that are dark, and tricks that are vain," not excelled by the "Heathen Chinees," or the most astute diplomatist. In fact diplomacy is the fitting word to apply to the tactics of the Jesuits. Noah Webster says of them, "The Society was first established in the United States in 1807, and the members of it are chiefly engaged in teaching or as missionaries. The Jesuits have displayed in their enterprises a high degree of zeal, learning, policy and skill, but by their opponents have been generally reputed to use art and intrigue in promoting or accomplishing their purposes, whence the words Jesuit, Jesuitical, and the like, have acquired an odious and offensive sense."

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL McCLOSKEY.

Second Series.

LETTER IV.

NEW YORK, March 26th, 1885.

SIR :

In the admirable work of Mr. Henry C. Lea ("Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy") from which I quoted last month in reference to "monastic vows," I find further proof that the so-called celibacy of the priests of your Church has not conduced to a healthy state of morals at any period of its history. But to go back a little. The objects to be gained by celibacy are thus defined by Mr. Lea:

"About the middle of the fourth century, while the admirers of ascetic virginity became louder and more enthusiastic in their praises of that blessed condition, it is fair to presume that they were daily more sensible of a lower standard of morality in the ministers of the altar, and that their susceptibilities were more deeply shocked by the introduction and growth of abuses. While the Church was kept purified by the fires of persecution, it offered few attractions for the worldly and ambitious. Its ministry was too dangerous to be sought except by the pure and zealous Christian, and there was little danger that pastors would err except from over-tenderness of conscience or unthinking ardor. When, however, its temporal position was incalculably improved by its domination throughout the empire, it became the avenue through which ambition might attain its ends, while its wealth held out prospects of idle self-indulgence to the slothful and the sensual. A new class of men, dangerous alike from their talents or their vices, would thus naturally find their way into the fold, and corruption, masked under the semblance of austere virtue, or displayed with careless cynicism, would not be long in penetrating into the Holy of Holies. Immorality must have been flagrant when, in 370, the temporal power felt the necessity of interfering by a law of the Emperor Valentinian which denounced severe punishment on ecclesiastics who visited the houses of widows and virgins. When an increasing laxity of morals thus threatened to overcome the purity of the Church, it is not surprising that the advocates of asceticism should have triumphed over the more moderate and conservative party, and that they should improve their victory by seeking a remedy for existing evils in such laws as should render the strictest continence imperative on all who entered into holy orders.

"It appears to me not unreasonable to suppose that all these various motives lent additional force to the zeal for the purity of the Church, and to the undoubting belief in the necessity of perpetual celibacy, which impelled

the Popes, about the year 385, to issue the first definite command imposing it as an absolute rule of discipline on the ministers of the altar. The question evidently was one which largely occupied the minds of men, and the conclusion was reached progressively. A Roman synod, to which the date of 384 is assigned, answered a series of interrogatories propounded by the bishops of Gaul, among which was one relating to the chastity of the priesthood. In its reply allusion was made to the inconsistency of exhortations to virginity proceeding from those who themselves were involved in family cares and duties, a reasonable view when we consider how much of ecclesiastical machinery by this time turned on monachism; and the necessity was urged of bishops, priests, and deacons preserving the purity requisite to fit them for the daily sacrifice of the altar and the ministration of the sacraments. This latter point was based upon the assumption of a similar abstinence being imposed by the old law on the Levites during their term of service in the Temple, and the example of the pagan priesthood was indignantly adduced to shame those who could entertain a sacrilegious doubt upon a matter so self-evident. The conclusion arrived at was definite, but, as I have already remarked, no means were suggested or commanded for its enforcement."

How this movement in the Church affected the morality of the clergy can be seen from some instances given by Mr. Lea. He writes:

"What was the condition of the Church resulting from these prolonged and persistent efforts may be guessed from one or two examples. When, in 1139, Nigel, Bishop of Ely, in England, revolted against King Stephen, he intrusted the defence of his castle of Devizes to his concubine, Maud of Ramsbury. She bravely fulfilled her charge and repulsed the assaults of the king, until he bethought him of a way to compel a surrender. Obtaining possession of Roger, son of Maud and Nigel, the unhappy youth was brought before the walls, and preparations were made to hang him in his mother's sight. At this her courage gave way, and she capitulated at once. Though the monkish chronicler stigmatizes Maud as '*pellex episcopi*' she may probably have been his wife—in either case the publicity of the connection is a sufficient commentary on the morals and manners of the age.

"If this be attributed to the unbridled turbulence of Stephen's reign, we may turn to the comparatively calmer times of Henry II., when Alexander III., amid his ceaseless efforts to restore the Church discipline of England, in 1171, ordered the Bishops of Exeter and Worcester and the Abbot of Feversham to examine and report as to the evil reputation of Clarembald, abbot-elect of St. Augustine's of Canterbury. In the execution of this duty they found that that venerable patriarch had seventeen bastards in one village; purity he ridiculed as an impossibility, while even licentiousness had no attraction for his exhausted senses unless spiced with the zest of publicity. That a man whose profligacy was so openly and shamelessly defiant could be elected to the highest place in the oldest and most honored religious community in England is a fact which lends color to the assertion of a writer of the time of King John, that clergy

and laity were indistinguishably bad, and perhaps justifies the anecdote told of Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, who assumed that the clergy were much worse than the laity."

In Italy the adoption of the rule of celibacy did not produce better results than in England. We read: "In Italy, the condition of discipline may be inferred from the fact that, in 721, Pope Gregory II. considered it necessary to call a synod for the special purpose of condemning incestuous unions and the marriages of nuns, which he declared were openly practised, and the canons then promulgated received so little attention that they had to be repeated by another synod in 732. In fact, the vow of chastity was frequently taken by widows that they might escape a second marriage and thus be able to live in shameless license without being subject to the watchful control of a husband, and an edict of Arechis, Duke of Beneventum, about the year 774 orders that all such godless women shall be seized and shut up in convents.

"In France, it may be readily believed that discipline was even more neglected. For eighty years scarce a council was held; no attempts were made to renew or enforce the rules of discipline, and the observances of religion were at length well-nigh forgotten. In 726, Boniface even felt scruples as to associating in ordinary intercourse with men so licentious and depraved as the Frankish bishops and priests, and he applied to Gregory II. for the solution of his doubts. Gregory, in reply, ordered him to employ argument in endeavoring to convince them of their errors, and by no means to withdraw himself from their society, a politic toleration of vice contrasting strangely with his fierce defiance of the iconoclastic heresy of Leo the Isaurian, when he risked the papacy itself in his eagerness to preserve his beloved images."

It would be an unprofitable task to recapitulate the constantly repeated legislation prohibiting the residence of women with the clergy and repressing the disorders and irregularities of the monastic establishments. It would be but a reiteration of the story so common in all periods of history, and its only importance would be in showing by the frequency of the edicts how utterly ineffectual they were.

"But perhaps the most convincing evidence of the debased morality of the clergy, and of the low standard which even the most zealous prelates were forced to adopt, is to be found in a curious fabrication by the authors of the *False Decretals* (in the eighth century). The collection of decretals which they put forth in the names of the early popes embodied their conception of a perfect Church establishment, as adapted to the necessities and aspirations of the ninth century. While straining every point to throw off all subjection to the temporal power, and to obtain for the hierarchy full and absolute control over all ecclesiastical matters and persons, they seem to have felt it necessary to relax in an important point the rigor of the canons respecting sacerdotal purity. Gregory the Great had proclaimed in the clearest and most definite manner the rule that a single lapse from virtue condemned the sinner to irrevocable degradation, and rendered him forever unfit for the ministry of the altar. Yet 'Isidor Mercator' added to a genuine epistle of Gregory a long passage

elaborately arguing the necessity of forgiveness for those who expiate by repentance the sin of impurity, 'of which, among many, so few are guiltless.'

"Evidence, also, is not wanting, that the denial of the appropriate and healthful human affections led to the results which might be expected of fearful and unnatural crimes. That the inmates of monasteries, debarred from female society, occasionally abandoned themselves to the worst excesses, or, breaking through all restraint, indulged in less reprehensible but more open scandals, is proclaimed by Charlemagne, who threatened to vindicate the outrage upon religion with the severest punishment. Nor were the female convents more successfully regulated, for the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 836, states that in many places they were rather brothels than houses of God; and it shows how close a supervision over the spouses of Christ was thought requisite when it proceeds to direct that nunneries shall be so built as to have no dark corners in which scandals may be perpetrated out of view. The effect of these efforts may be estimated from a remark in a collection of laws which bears the name of Erchenbald, Chancellor of Charlemagne, but which is rather attributable to the close of the ninth century, that the licentiousness of nuns commonly resulted in a worse crime—infanticide; and, as this is extracted textually from an epistle of St. Boniface to Ethelbald, King of Mercia, it is presumable that the evil became notorious simultaneously with the reform under the early Carolingians, and continued unabated throughout their dynasty. One device to subjugate nature, adopted in the monasteries, was to let blood at stated intervals, in the hope of reducing the system and thus mitigating the effects of prolonged continence—a device prohibited by Louis-le-Débonnaire, but long subsequently maintained as part of monastic discipline. As regards the secular clergy, even darker horrors are asserted by Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, and other prelates, who forbade to their clergy the residence of mother, aunt, and sister, in consequence of the crimes so frequently perpetrated with them at the instigation of the devil; and the truth of this hideous fact is unfortunately confirmed by the declarations of councils held at various periods."

Faugh! Cardinal, the discussion of this subject is too disgusting to pursue it any further. But Celibacy can never be made clean in your Church or in any Church where it is enforced. I have done with the subject, and will turn to more agreeable topics in my next letter.

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

The first series of "FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL McCLOSKEY" have been collected into a volume of 192 pages. The contents are varied, instructive and highly interesting. Protestants and Catholics will read this book with pleasure and profit. Fourth edition now ready. Price, paper cover, 30 cents; excelsior cloth, 50 cents; cloth extra, gilt edge, \$1.00. Sent post free from this office.

ROME: PAGAN AND PAPAL.

(Continued from Page 128.)

CHAPTER VIII.

A DEVICE OF MAN FOR HIS OWN SALVATION.

There is in Scripture the record of an anxious inquirer who, nearly three thousand years ago, asked what he could do to expiate his sins—how he could find peace for his soul. The answer was that the Lord required him to do justly, and to love mercy, and walk humbly with his God. And so far as it went, this answer was good; though we, with our present light, would be able to refer such an inquirer at once to “the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world.”

Upon the conscience of this inquirer there was a burden of guilt so heavy that he would have made any sacrifice to be delivered from it. “Shall I,” he cried, “give my firstborn for my transgression; the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?”

And as it was with him, so throughout all generations it ever has been, is, and will be, with every conscience-stricken sinner. As soon as man feels a sense of sin, he will, if he be ignorant of the Atonement which Christ has made, manifest an earnest desire to find some way of expiating his iniquities, and of recommending himself to God. This is the religion of nature; and it is ever conspicuous in heathenism, which is the outcome of nature.

As a rule, man is sure, sooner or later, to feel himself a transgressor; and, as a transgressor—if he be ignorant of the One Atonement—he seeks to make expiation for himself. Hence came self-inflicted tortures, scourgings, penance, privations, pilgrimages, and retirements to the hermitage or the cloister. And the universality of these religious practices—common, as they are, to all countries and all times—prove that they are no characteristic of particular races, tribes, or classes; but that they indicate a want felt by all humanity.

To meet this universal want, to calm the palpitating heart of anxious men, and to guide their steps into the way of salvation, God has given the glad tidings of his Word, which speaks peace through the sinners’ Friend, the Lord Jesus Christ. And how stands the case? Man thinks he must do something to recommend himself to God. No, says the Scripture: for in the first place you *can do nothing* to recommend yourself; nor, again, is there need, since you are already recommended. Christ is your Saviour, and all that is to be done, or can be done, has been accomplished by him. Your part is but to believe on him; then his perfect atonement becomes effectual for you, and his wealth of righteousness is put to your account. “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.”

Such, then, is God's simple and gracious method of salvation. This is *his* way of peace and holiness, and he declares that there is none other. Man, however, has many devices for the attainment of the same end, and we will now say a few words respecting one of these devices—that of self-inflicted privations and pains. Consider two scourges. One of them is heathen—*ancient* Roman; the other is Christian—*modern* Roman. The former is from a marble in the Capitol Museum at Rome, and is figured in F. Righetti's great work (plate 130). The marble is very remarkable. It represents a priest of Cybele, an *archigallus* in full costume, with medals on his head and a picture hung round his neck, displaying the sacred *vitta* or garland, and bearing the *aspergillum*, or pot of holy water, and the whip which these priests of "the Great Mother" were wont to use upon themselves. This whip was a terrible instrument of torture, similar to the *flagellum*, or metal-loaded scourge, with which slaves were punished. The thongs, as I have noted, are loaded with small squares: these are bones—pastern, or knuckle bones, *knucks*—of sheep, which must have inflicted a terrible punishment.

The other scourge is an original which I bought at Rome, in the Lent of 1852, at the church of the Flagellants. It is a severe instrument when applied to the bare back; its length is about two feet, and it is made of stout cord. There is a peculiar way of using it which was once explained to me by a French ex-Trappist. The operator kneels down and strikes over his shoulders, right and left—over the right shoulder with a back-handed blow. This is done rapidly, according to the zeal of the flagellant; and, I need not say, with a very painful effect.

In the Church at Rome the *disciplina* was at night, and was thus arranged: The monks assembled and sat in the choir, where I also sat with them. A few candles only were burning, just so many as to enable the brother who handed round the scourges to see his way. All the candles except one were then extinguished, and by that feeble light I saw a little, while I heard much, of what was going on. The brethren—some of them at any rate, perhaps all—laid aside their garments and commenced the discipline. The church resounded with the strokes, but I heard no cries: all the monks were kneeling—some thirty or forty, perhaps—on the choir floor, opposite to each other. The exercise lasted some minutes; then the candles were relit, and we departed. A strange experience.

Ill-tempered people will say that the flagellants lashed the benches instead of themselves. I cannot tell. But the impression left upon my *mind* was that the discipline was real; while the impression left upon my *heart* was sad and painful. Every lash told me that "by his stripes" they were not healed; every reverberation echoing through the roof was a denial of the glad tidings of *free* salvation, for they by their pains and penalties were seeking to purchase it. They were as those Jews who, "going about to establish their own righteousness, did not submit themselves to the righteousness of God." (Rom. x., 3.) While everything had been done for them by another, they were seeking to do everything for themselves: they were stultifying the work of Christ, and raising up a

righteousness in opposition and antagonism to his. Such is the whole monastic system. It is "another Gospel," a device of the natural man for saving himself.

Poor men! My heart bled for them, and I longed to see them delivered out of such Pagan darkness into the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ. For what real difference is there between the priests of Cybele, the Corybantes, or Galli, scourging themselves to appease their deity, and these flagellant monks? They were both alike in worshipping, not the God of Scripture, but a being of their own depraved and sensuous imagination; in following, not the guidance of God's Word, but the instincts of their own corrupt nature. In both cases the worship was Pagan; whether a pretence or a reality, it set forth the shedding of man's blood as the ransom for man's sin, and thereby ignored and trampled under foot the precious blood which was shed at Calvary.

The flagellant priests of Cybele were, like the modern monks who exercise the same vocation, ascetics; and they were well known in the same great city of Rome. Asceticism—a term derived from a Greek word which means *discipline*—together with monkery, had its origin, like most other superstitions, in the East. Thence it found its way to Rome and the West, at the time of the introduction of the worship of Cybele from Phrygia, if not earlier. There is a curious story respecting the conveyance of the miraculous image of Cybele to Rome, very similar to those which are told of other images of the same character. The ship which brought it from Phrygia ran aground in the mud at the entrance of the Tiber, and no power could move it, until, so runs the story, a young girl—whose character had been aspersed, poor thing—came, and, attaching her veil to the galley, drew it miraculously into the river. Such miracles are not uncommon in the region of superstition, whether of ancient or modern heathenism. Have you, reader, been to Lourdes?

Besides the Corybantes, there were other monkish priests at Rome in early ages, such as those of Serapis, the Egyptian Nile-god, so famed for the magnificence and glory of his worship.

The great "high place" of this divinity was Alexandria, where from an artificial mound rose the sumptuous temple erected either by Alexander or by the Ptolemy who immediately succeeded him. "There," says Milman, "all around the spacious level platform, rose the habitations of the priests and of the ascetics dedicated to the worship of the god. The temple was ascended by a hundred steps; and beneath were the dark chambers used for orgies which would not bear the light of day, and where the noblest and most beautiful women were sacrificed to the lust of the officials of the temple."—Milman, *Hist. of Christ*, vol. iii., p. 68.

By the aid of torches I have visited some of these dark subterranean precincts. Their vastness, no less than the fine and delicate finish of all the huge stonework of their formation, amazed me. And what obscurity, coupled with what hopelessness of escape! Fitting places, indeed, for evil men and for deeds of darkness.

Two instances have now been given of the early introduction of asceticism

into Europe from the East. The practice seems, however, to have found its way among us at a still more remote period; for it was one of the earliest and most wide-spread manifestations of the corruption of pure and primitive religion.

In Chaldea, Thibet, China, Japan, and in India, priestly celibacy has been a custom from time immemorial, and the history of those countries bears copious testimony to the abominations which have flowed from it. In Athens there were sacred virgins bound to celibacy; and again in Scandinavia we hear of an order of nuns of noble family, whose duty it was to keep alive the sacred fire. The similar office of the Vestal virgins at Rome, and the dreadful fate which awaited them in case of incontinency, are well known. In Peru, under the rule of the Incas, the same institution existed in the Virgins of the Sun. "These," says Prescott, "were young maidens dedicated to the service of the deity, who at a tender age were taken from their homes and introduced into convents, where they were placed under the care of certain elderly matrons—*Mamaconas* that is, *Mother Priestesses*—who had grown grey within their walls." Their duty also was to keep watch over the sacred fire; and to be buried alive was, as in the case of the Roman Vestal, their dreadful doom if their frailty yielded to temptation. So, too, the incontinent nun of later times, when the mason had done his murderous work, found her living tomb in the wall of the convent.

One cannot but think of the scene in "*Marmion*," which depicts the end of poor Constance—

"Sister, let thy sorrows cease;"

and of the offending monk—

"Sinful brother, part in peace."

In 1852, travellers on their road to Rome were shown a skeleton so immured in a wall at Perugia. And Scott, in his notes to "*Marmion*," mentions that "among the ruins of the abbey of Coldingham were some years ago discovered the remains of a female skeleton, which, from the shape of the niche and position of the figure, seemed to be that of an immured nun."

Execrable system, which first dooms its victims to an enforced celibacy, and then with irresponsible power, and in secret tribunal, condemns them to the horrors of a terrible and lingering death if they yield to the instincts of outraged humanity! Yet such is the system which many among us would wish to see re-established in our own country!

CHAPTER IX.

CELIBATES AND SOLITARIES.

While John the Baptist "came neither eating nor drinking," and made his home in the wilderness, our Lord "came eating and drinking," and dwelt among men. Taking advantage of this fact, his enemies were wont to say: "Behold, a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners;" in other words, a sensualist and an associate of the profligate and the vile.

Now, by following the solitary and ascetic life of John, and declining the social life of Christ, the monastic system of Christendom declares its choice of the former and its rejection of the latter; shows its preference of the Law to the Gospel, of John to Jesus, of man to God. Monasticism is thus, from age to age, a permanent witness to the fact that the wisdom which is from beneath is opposed to the wisdom which is from above; that man's plan of salvation is diverse from God's.

Monasticism repudiates marriage; but it can find no Scriptural authority for such a course. The first celibate and the first solitary was Adam. But God said, "It is not good for man to be alone;" and so having formed Eve, he brought her to Adam to be his companion and his wife. Rome, on the contrary, affirms that the state of the solitary and the celibate is the nearest to perfection.

God says: "Increase and multiply." Rome builds monasteries and forbids to marry.

God says: "I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house" (I. Tim. v., 14). Rome confines them within the gloomy walls of convents, and prohibits obedience to God's command.

And this the apostate Church does in the face of the fact that our Lord honored wedlock by his presence and miraculous assistance at the marriage in Cana of Galilee—in the face of the prophecy, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith . . . forbidding to marry!"

Indeed, so reckless is Rome of Divine authority that she pronounces the monastic life to be the perfection of Christianity—the highest of all spiritual attainments. She styles it "the religious life" *par excellence*; calls those who practise it "the religious;" and whether they be men or women, considers that they amass through their vows such a wealth of righteousness and merits that they can spare some for others who are not "religious" like themselves, and even for the souls in purgatory.

But now comes the question, Why is Rome thus opposed to marriage?

Because by means of celibacy she is enabled to detach from society, in all countries, a multitude of men and women whom she uses to forward her own selfish interests and intrigues to the detriment of society. Consider how vast a power she wields throughout the whole world in those myriads of monks and nuns who stand ever ready to do her bidding! Nay, how mighty an engine does she possess in that one department of the system, the confessional! Abolish celibacy, and you remove her chief support and stay. Who, then, can wonder at her earnest and impassioned appeals for its maintenance and extension?

But the question might be asked, can you, then, perceive no good thing in connection with monasticism? I should be sorry to say so much as that. Nay, what chance would it have had in the world unless there had been some good mingled with it? It must have had something whereby to allure the many excellent and honest individuals who have submitted themselves to it; and to those who, despite the influences brought to bear upon them, have rested, not on it,

but on Christ, it may have been sometimes beneficial. Often, for example, amid the wars and massacres and anarchy of the Dark Ages, cloister life provided an asylum for the persecuted, the weary, the hopeless, and the ruined. And, to men and women of a certain temperament, it must have presented great attractions, promising as it did—and not always without some fulfilment of the promise—a quiet and comfortable home, the society, perhaps, of spiritual and intellectual companions, opportunities for retirement, study, and devotion, time for the cultivation of the contemplative life, and an absence of gnawing cares and of many temptations of the world.

But after all has been said, nothing can countervail the truth of God. For the monastic life is, as we have seen, unlawful: it is opposed both by the example of Christ and by the precepts of his Word; it is a retrogression from the liberty of the Gospel to the bondage of the Law, from faith to works. Besides which the system of monastic vows is sinful, and the forcible detention of its victim through all the long years of life soon becomes intolerable. The cloister, if you will; celibacy, if you will; but no vows. God will have us to preserve our liberty. "Be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage," is his command; and how terrible a yoke have multitudes found these vows to be! No; however well-intentioned, however useful it may have been at first, the whole system is wrong; and the vow should be broken as soon as the conscience, through the Word of God, is convinced that it is sinful.

But monks and solitary ascetics are by no means confined to the Romish Church. I have recently seen representations of two anchorites; the one Christian, the other Pagan; the one ancient, the other modern; the one from Europe, the other from Asia. Both of them are inhabitants of the desert; both are in a state of nudity, disgusting and pitiable objects; both have their beads, which are more necessary to them than clothing; both are holy men in the estimation of their co-religionists, and bear the name of saints.

The first represented St. Giles, and was adapted from Mrs. Jameson's *Monastic Orders*. The second was taken from a series of drawings "illustrating Hindoo Mythology," which were lately lent to the South Kensington Museum by Colonel Ousley. The use of the chaplets, rosaries, or beads, which may be seen in both pictures, is one of the many heathen practices which have been imported into Christianity.

I might add a description of two other such saints—Mohammedans, and held in the highest veneration—from my own personal observation. It was in Egypt that I saw them; the one was walking in the neighborhood of a town; the other, whom I will describe, was seated near the Nile in Upper Egypt, not far from a village where he had lived—so I was told—for fourteen years. Both of these men were perfectly naked.

Observing one day a number of people assembled at some distance, I inquired what was going on, and, on being told that a saint was the attraction, went to see him. I found the holy man surrounded by about thirty men and women who had their eyes fixed admiringly upon him as he sat upon the ground undraped—in the conventional language of art—and presenting a disgusting

appearance. His body was much covered with hair of a reddish color, while the hair of his head was like the wool of sheep; his skin, scorched by the fierce sun, was scorbutic and scarlet; his person was large and fat—these ascetics are well supplied with food by the people—and his countenance was sensual in the extreme. Such was the unclothed and unwashed creature, dignified by the name of saint, which I saw in the country where, in times long past, Simon the Stylite, and other ascetics, *his predecessors*, had in their ignorance degraded and bestialized our common humanity.

The crowd of admirers which surrounded him were kissing his hand; while the women touched his filthy flesh and then kissed their finger, hoping thereby to receive some virtue in regard to progeny. Even our dragoman, as well as some of the ship's company, did the same as the others. The former I rebuked for so doing, because I knew him to be a Syrian Christian. "I beg your pardon sir," said he, "I kissed my thumb."

Kissed his thumb! I remember, when a child in Devonshire, hearing just the same thing said of a man who had been sworn on the Testament in a court of justice. "No; he did not kiss the book, he kissed his thumb." And so his oath was invalid!

Men are alike in all parts of the world; the astute Syrian and the Devonian clown have the same nature, and the same tendency to resort to subterfuge. And, because this is the case, all men have, if left to themselves, one religion, that of their common nature. Look at the two saints I have described, the European and the Indian, the Christian and the heathen—what difference is there between them? Then compare them with the saint of the Nile. Is not he, too, of precisely the same type? European, Asiatic, and African, differing as they do in nationality, language, color, habits, and faith, are yet, as unregenerate men, one in spirit; and, being ignorant of God's Word, carry out, each in his peculiar creed, the leading instincts of natural religion. Our own fathers were no better; and had not the light of the Gospel shone into our hearts, we should be like them. "But for the grace of God, there goes John Bradford," as that good man said when he saw a criminal being led to execution.

(To be Continued.)

REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR, the author of the "LETTERS TO CARDINAL McCLOSKEY" (and Editor of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC), was for many years a Roman Catholic priest; he is now pastor of the Reformed Catholic Church, New York. We have read his "Letters" with thrilling interest. Though they contain undeniable facts—alarming facts—shameful facts—they nevertheless read like a strange and wonderful romance. O'Connor talks like Luther; he unveils the corruptions of the priesthood in the style of Luther; he challenges investigation on every charge he makes. He addresses Cardinal McCloskey in respectful language, but he impales him alive upon the piercing points of truth. After such an arraignment, it would seem impossible for the lordly Cardinal to hold up his head and look the public in full face. We would advise all our readers to obtain the work, and to read it, and to circulate it. Especially let honest Catholics read it, and have their eyes opened to the despotism of the Pope and the corruptions of Romanism.—*Am. Christian Review.*